

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In Re Application of:

Christopher Cressy

Serial No. 09/667,625

Group Art Unit: 2621

Filed: 09/22/2000

Examiner: David J. Czekaj

For: VISUAL SECURITY OPERATIONS SYSTEM

Attorney Docket No: 7784-001023/US (02-0741)

**REPLY BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer mailed December 19, 2008, Applicants submit the following remarks with respect to the Examiner's new grounds of rejection.

## REMARKS

Appellants respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner's position for each and every ground of rejection. The response to argument begins on page 9 and extends to page 15 of the Examiner's Answer. Appellants will refer to each of the Examiner's paragraphs which are noted in the Examiner's Answer by a lower case roman numeral.

Paragraph i refers to claim 16 and, more specifically, the clause:

"When the security device signal is generated, automatically changing a display to a first video signal of the plurality of video signals in response to the security device signal, wherein the display comprises a touch screen."

Admittedly, the Yonezawa reference teaches a touch screen. In response to the arguments presented in the Appeal Brief, the Examiner states:

"Thus, simply turning the touch screen on and off would read on the broadly claimed touch screen."

Appellants respectfully disagree. A security device is set forth earlier in the claims. This clause specifically refers to automatically changing a display to a first video signal in response to the security device signal. The display comprises a touch screen display. Appellants are unclear as to how simply turning on and off a touch screen would read broadly on the claim. The Examiner fails to provide any explicit analysis for this over-reaching conclusion. Instead, the Examiner continues paragraph i with a description of the Paff and Yonezawa references. Appellants respectfully submit that neither of the two references teaches automatically changing a touch screen to a first video signal in response to the security device signal when the security device signal is generated.

With respect to paragraph ii, the Examiner responds to the argument that there is no motivation for combining Paff with Yonezawa. The Examiner points to column 1, lines 47-55 referring to the need set forth by Yonezawa that an observer cannot freely rearrange the video

display in order to make them easier to handle or cannot select the video camera images which are merely displayed. The disclosure of the present application uses the touch screen so that the particular feature may be repositioned to the point selected that translates to the center of the view frustum. The Examiner merely points to the motivation for the Yonezawa reference and not in relation to the present disclosure.

With respect to paragraph iii, the Examiner addresses the argument that Paff fails to disclose the icon corresponding to a security device volume. As mentioned in the Appeal Brief, the Paff reference discloses two dimensional icons, not three dimensional icons. Therefore, no coverage volume, which is a three dimensional property. Therefore, the rejection of claim 18 should not be maintained.

With respect to paragraph iv, the Examiner refers to the argument with respect to claim 21. Claim 21 is a dependent claim that depends from claim 16 and recites in response to touching an icon on the touch screen, directing movement of the display. As mentioned above, Appellants admit that Yonezawa does teach a touch screen display. Paff discloses icons. What is not taught is that by touching an icon on the touch screen, the movement of the display is directed by the user. The touching of an icon can thus direct movement of the display. The Examiner focuses on the touch aspect of the display rather than directing movement of the display as set forth in the claim. The movement of the display is set forth in various places through the present disclosure including that beginning on page 13 which refers to terrain point-to-fly and the sensor point-to-fly described on page 15.

With respect to paragraph v, the Examiner disagrees with the Appellants' argument that the Paff reference fails to disclose the icon is translucent. Claim 24 recites that the icon is translucent. The Paff reference provides no description for the icons. Therefore, Appellants

refer to Figs. 4 and 5 in which the icons appear to be transparent since the walls illustrated in the floor plan can be clearly seen. The definition of translucent according to the freedictionary.com, is allowing light to pass through, but not transparent. Clearly there is no indication in the drawings of Paff that the walls within the camera field of view are partially hidden.

With respect to paragraph vi, the Examiner disagrees with the Appellants' argument for claim 27 which recites a two dimensional icon displayed on a two dimensional display and a three dimensional icon displayed on a three dimensional display. The Examiner points to Fig. 8 of the Yonezawa reference and specifically to reference numeral 632. Reference numeral 632 as set forth in column 6, line 23 recites a garbage can icon for deleting a displayed camera video from a video display area. Claim 27 recites both that an icon comprises a two dimensional icon displayed on the two dimensional display and a three dimensional icon displayed on the three dimensional display. The garbage can 632 even if it is considered a three dimensional icon is not displayed on a three dimensional display. Therefore, the Examiner's argument with respect to claim 27 fails in at least two ways.

In paragraph vii, the Examiner disagrees with the Appellants' argument with respect to claim 28 that Yonezawa fails to disclose a three-dimensional display and a two-dimensional display on separate screens. The Examiner merely points to the Yonezawa reference. After reviewing the description set forth in the paragraph beginning in column 6, line 15, it appears that Fig. 8 is a representation of windows 500, 600 that are described as being displayed on the same screen or on different screens. However, the windows 500, 600 are not described as a three-dimensional display and a two-dimensional display on separate screens. The window 500 merely appears to have two-dimensional shape. Window 600 is merely described as having a

video display area which, again, is not a three-dimensional display. Appellants, therefore, respectfully submit that claim 28 is allowable.

Paragraph viii sets forth the Examiner's disagreement with the Appellants' argument with respect to claim 30 that Paff fails to disclose the icon corresponding to an alarm state as performed by changing a material property of the icon. The Examiner points to the color of the icon changing in column 9, lines 35-45 of the Paff reference. Appellants respectfully submit that a material property is different than color as used in the present disclosure. The present disclosure states:

“Upon receipt of a state-changing event from a piece of security equipment in the field, the invention renders a customizable animation whose color, material properties, and animation depict such information as alarm priority, ongoing alarm or past alarm, tamper status, disconnected, acknowledged, selected), etc.”

By this passage it is clear that a material property is different than color as defined in the present disclosure. Appellants, therefore, respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner's position with respect to claim 30.

With respect to paragraph ix, the Examiner disagrees with the Appellants' argument with respect to claim 33 that the Paff reference fails to disclose displaying an alarm priority with the alarm. Appellants respectfully submit that a normal state and a trip state is indicated in the Paff passage. However, there is no indication of a priority of this alarm versus any other alarm. Therefore, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 33 is also believed to be allowable.

In paragraph x, the Examiner disagrees with the Appellants' argument with respect to claim 35 that Paff fails to disclose displaying the tamper status with the icon. The Examiner merely refers again to column 9, lines 35-44 and 55-60 which indicate a tripped and non-tripped state but do not indicate that the security device has been tampered with. Therefore, Appellants

respectfully submit that claim 35 is also allowable and respectfully requests the Board to reverse the Examiner's position.

With respect to paragraph xi, the Examiner disagrees with Appellants argument with respect to claim 37 that Paff fails to disclose displaying in a knowledge state with the icon. There are several different state-changing events that may be derived from the security equipment in the field. The various events whose animation may depict information such as an alarm priority, ongoing alarm or pass alarm, tamper status, disconnected, acknowledged, selected (by the user), etc. This is set forth in lines 1-19 of page 10 of the current disclosure. Clearly, selected and acknowledged are two different types of information. As mentioned by the Examiner, the Paff reference does describe clicking on an icon and visually indicating that the camera is selected. However, this does not provide an indication to acknowledgement as set forth in claim 37. Therefore, Appellants respectfully submit claim 37 is also believed to be allowable.

In paragraph xii, the Examiner disagrees with the Appellants' argument with respect to claim 38. Claim 38 recites:

“Wherein automatically changing a display to a video signal corresponding to the video device comprises flying in a predetermined manner to a predetermined view of the security device.”

The Examiner points to column 8, lines 30-55 for defining zoom parameters of certain cameras. Appellants respectfully submit that zoom parameters are very different than the flying effect set forth in claim 38. In a flying state, it is clear from the disclosure that the actual position of the camera is moved and not merely changing a camera function such as panning, tilting and moving from a fixed or static position. In fact, claim 38 recites flying in a *predetermined manner* to a *predetermined view* of the security device. Therefore, flying is to a

point of viewing the actual security device rather than the panning, tilting or movement of the security device itself. Paff merely refers to panning and tilting or movement of the security device. By providing a flying view in the present claim, the system operator has a perspective of the security device and the area covered by the security device. A predetermined view of the security device is claimed. The predetermined view is flown to. Appellants, therefore, respectfully submit that claim 38 is also allowable due to the deficiencies in the Paff reference.

In paragraph xiii, the Examiner disagrees with the Appellants' argument with respect to claim 42 that the Paff reference fails to disclose automatically sending hardware commands to other devices in response to the alarm signal. The Examiner points to column 6, lines 13-17 for this teaching. The processor 10 illustrated in Fig. 2 of the Paff reference is described as controlling many different features including the VCR in the column 6 passage. However, this passage does not teach automatically sending hardware signals to other devices in response to the alarm. It can only be presumed that the input device 2 allows the operator to control such activity. Therefore, Appellants respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner's position with respect to claim 42.

With respect to paragraph xiv, the Examiner is referring to claim 43 which depends from claim 42. Claim 43 recites that the "other devices" set forth in paragraph 42 include a digital video recorder. For the same reasons set forth above, the Paff reference does not include automatically sending hardware commands to, in this case, a digital video recorder. Hobson merely discloses a digital video recording system. Appellants, therefore, respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner's position with respect to claim 43.

In paragraph xv, the Examiner disagrees with the Appellants' assertion with respect to claim 21 that Paff, in view of Box, fails to disclose changing the animation of the icon. The Box

reference does not teach or suggest an alarm system or an alarm state. The Box reference does teach an animated icon. The Paff reference merely teaches changing the color from a trip state to a non-active state. Therefore, the combination of the reference does not display the icon on the display corresponding to the alarm state by changing an animation of the icon. Further, the Examiner fails to provide the explicit analysis required by the KSR case for making such a combination. For these reasons, Appellants respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner's position with respect to claim 21.

With respect to paragraph xvi, the Examiner disagrees with Appellants' assertion that the Yonezawa reference fails to disclose displaying icons, wherein each icon corresponds to a three-dimensional field of view of coverage of the security device. Appellants admit that camera icons are illustrated in Fig. 8 as reference numerals 521, 523, and 524. The field of view of one of the cameras 523 is illustrated. However, this field of view is merely an area and does not correspond to a three-dimensional field of view. A three-dimensional field of view would have a volume rather than the two-dimensional pie-shaped piece illustrated in Fig. 8 of the Yonezawa reference. The difference between two-dimensional and three-dimensional is described in several places above.



In view of the above arguments, Appellants respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner's position and pass the case to allowance forthwith. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this matter, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 17, 2009

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Mark D. Eldhuck, Reg. No. 33,686

Kevin G. Mierzwa, Reg. No. 38,049

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600 (Tel)  
(248) 641-0270 (Fax)